



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,381	02/23/2005	Timothy S. Stevens	36-1887	3945
23117 7590 05/30/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
SMITH, GARRETT A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/525,381

Applicant(s)

STEVENS ET AL.

Examiner

Garrett Smith

Art Unit

2168

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is regarding Applicant's response filed 14 March 2008 to a prior Office action. Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 21 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 15 and 16 are amended. Claims 17 – 21 are new.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed 14 March 2008 in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 14 March 2008 has been entered.
3. This Office Action is the **Third Action, Non-Final Rejection**.

Response to Arguments

35 USC § 102

4. Applicant's arguments (page 7 – 8) and amendments, filed 14 March 2008, regarding the rejection under 35 USC § 102(b) of claims 1 – 4, 6 – 10, 14, 15 and 17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Reber et al. does not perform certain features “automatically”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Even though the term “automatically” is now given patentable weight, Reber et al still performs the features with the assistance of the computer system. Any process completed using a computer can be reasonably considered to be done “automatically” at least in some facet. The Examiner further notes that most of the

Examiner's response in the Final Office Action dated 18 September 2008 is still applies to the current claims. For these reasons, the rejection under 35 USC § 102(b) of claims 1 – 4, 6 – 10, 14, 15 and 17 is **maintained**.

35 USC § 103(a)

5. Applicant's arguments (page 7 – 8) and amendments, filed 14 March 2008, regarding the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) of claims 11 – 13 and 16 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See arguments provided in the above section. The Examiner further notes that most of the Examiner's response in the Final Office Action dated 18 September 2008 is still applies to the current claims. For these reasons, the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) of claims 11 – 13 and 16 is **maintained**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims **1 – 4, 6 – 10, 14, 15 and 17 – 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reber et al (US Patent 5,584,006; patented 10 December 1996).

8. **In regard to claim 1**, Reber et al teaches a method of synthesizing a media article comprising: automatically reading digital metadata associated with a first set of

stored media data ([col 3, lines 52 – 54], the table of relations links the linear media data and any digitized media data), which digital metadata includes: related set identity data identifying a second set of stored media data ([col 11, lines 41 – 49] the table of relations contains the identifiers for the second set of data which is deemed equivalent); and relationship data which indicates the relationship between what represented by the first set of stored media data and what is represented by the second set of stored media data ([col 11, lines 41 – 49] the relationship between the two sets of media data is the equivalence of the media data including data on how the equivalent media overlap, what sequences overlap and their locations stored in the table of relationships; [col 11, 42 - 43] application arranges the media data in a time sequence and switches in and out media on the fly to keep what a user sees and hears in sequence); and automatically synthesizing said media article, said automatic synthesis including arranging said first and second sets of stored media data or identifiers thereof in said media article in accordance with said relationship data ([col 11, lines 39 – 41] the table of relations is analyzed by the application continuously to find equivalent media data, i.e. media data that can be part of the same time sequence from the same or different sources and arranges media data by changing sources as well as adding additional pieces of media data in accordance to the results of the analysis); and storing or outputting said media article (col 11, lines 39 – 49).

9. **In regard to claim 2**, Reber et al further teaches a method further comprising generating said related set identity data and said relationship data ([col 10, lines 36 - 38] relational information pertinent to the list of source identifiers is added to a list of

relational information i.e. generating relationship data, [col 10, lines 46-47] any new source identifiers are added to the source list i.e. generating identity data).

10. **In regard to claim 3**, Reber et al further teaches wherein said metadata further comprises content data indicating what is represented by said sets of stored media data (*[col 11, lines 5 – 7]; a time sequence that media data covers is stored in the table of relations as is shows equivalence*); said method further comprising: selecting, from said plurality of sets of stored media data; one or more selected sets of stored media data in dependence upon said content data (*[col 11, 34-38 and col 11, lines 43 - 47]; the application selections from set of media data the available and most complete media data based on the time sequence data*).

11. **In regard to claim 4**, Reber et al further teaches making a plurality of such selections (*[col 10, lines 57 – 58] covering a time sequence may take multiple sets of media data*); and concatenating the results of said selections (*[col 11, lines 7-8] a list is constructed of all results of the time sequence selection*).

12. **In regard to claim 6**, Reber et al further teaches said set of stored media data contains video data (*[col 1, lines 17-19]*)

13. **In regard to claim 7**, Reber et al teaches one or more memory devices storing, for each of a plurality of sets of stored media data include first and second sets of stored media data, metadata (*[col 11, lines 53-54] the table of relations is created and stored in memory*) which at least for said first set of media data includes: related set identify data identifying a second set of stored media data and relationship data which indicates the relationship between what represented by the first set of stored media data and what is

represented by the second set of stored media data ([col 11, 42 - 43] *application arranges the media data in a time sequence and switches in and out media on the fly to keep what a user sees and hears in sequence; [col 11, lines 41 - 49] the relationship between the two sets of media data is the equivalence of the media data including data on how the equivalent media overlap, what sequences overlap and their locations stored in the table of relationships*); and one or more digital processors in communication with said one or more memory devices and arranged in operation to automatically read said metadata and to automatically synthesize said media article, said automatic synthesis including arranging said first and second sets of stored media data or identifiers thereof in accordance with said relationship data read from said metadata ([col 11, lines 39 - 41] *the table of relations is analyzed by the application continuously to find equivalent media data, i.e. media data that can be part of the same time sequence from the same or different sources, and arranges media data by changing sources as well as adding additional pieces of media data in accordance to the results of the analysis*).

14. **In regard to claim 8**, Reber et al further teaches said relationship data indicates a causal relationship between what is represented by one of said sets of stored media data and what is represented by another of said sets of stored media data ([col 2, line 54], *time sequences purport a causal relationship*).

15. **In regard to claim 9**, Reber et al also teaches said one or more processors is further arranged in operation to provide a user with an interface enabling the user to

enter said relationship data ([col 6, lines 43 – 49] *Mfm_Create is an interface whereby the user can add new relationship data i.e. new time codes and sequences*).

16. **In regard to claim 10**, Reber et al further teaches said metadata is stored in a database ([col 11, lines 55 – 58]), and said one or more processors are further arranged in operation to query said database to obtain identifiers of sets of stored media data whose metadata meets one or more conditions specified in said query ([col 10, lines 57-59] a procedure of finding identifiers of media data from a query consisting of a source identifier and range identification).

17. **In regard to claim 14**, Reber et al also teaches a content store storing a plurality of sets of stored media data ([col 3, lines 39 – 41]), said metadata for each set of stored media data including a pointer to the location of said set of stored media data in said content store ([col 6 line 16], *media identifier is the pointer to the location of the media file*).

18. **In regard to claim 15**, Reber et al further teaches said one or more memories further store one or more media element selection criteria ([col 10, lines 57-59] *a procedure of finding identifiers of media data from a query consisting of a source identifier and range identification*), and said one or more processors are further arranged in operation to receive a set of media element identifiers and select said input set by selecting a subset of media element identifiers in accordance with said selection criteria ([col 11, lines 39 – 41] *the table of relations is analyzed by the application continuously to find equivalent media data, i.e. media data that can be part of the same time sequence from the same or different sources, and arranges media data by*

changing sources as well as adding additional pieces of media data in accordance to the results of the analysis).

19. **In regard to claim 17**, Reber et al further teaches said set of stored media data contains video data (*[col 1, lines 17-19]*).

20. **In regard to claims 18 – 21**, the Examiner notes that the phrase “so as” is used to set off intended use recitation. Therefore, the clause “to determine ... stored media”. Is determined to be intended use and thus has no patentable weight. However, Reber et al. teaches the arranging of stored media data and the intended use (*[col 11, lines 41 – 49] the relationship between the two sets of media data is the equivalence of the media data including data on how the equivalent media overlap, what sequences overlap and their locations stored in the table of relationships; [col 11, 42 - 43] application arranges the media data in a time sequence and switches in and out media on the fly to keep what a user sees and hears in sequence).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

23. Claims **11 – 13 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber et al (US Patent 5,584,006; patented 10 December 1996) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Sweat et al (US Patent 5,619,636; patented 8 April 1997).

24. **In regard to claim 11**, Reber et al teaches the invention as substantially claimed. Reber et al does not explicitly teach the use of an object-oriented database. However, Sweat et al teaches said database comprises an object-oriented database and metadata for each set of stored media data is stored as an object in said object-oriented database ([col 3, lines 54-57]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an object-oriented database of Sweat et al with the apparatus of Reber et al because it would allow for greater compatibility, modularity and easy of use for a user.

25. **In regard to claim 12**, Sweat et al further teaches said relationship data is stored as data, which defines the relationships between objects in the database ([col 3, lines 54-57] database "tracks and maintains references to media"). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an object-

oriented database of Sweat et al with the apparatus of Reber et al because it would allow for greater compatibility, modularity and easy of use for a user.

26. **In regard to claim 13**, Sweat et al further teaches membership of a set is indicated by each member in the set inheriting from a container object ([col 4, lines 32-40] a plurality of modules in a module is a container module which indicates membership of a set of related modules). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an object-oriented database of Sweat et al with the apparatus of Reber et al because it would allow for greater compatibility, modularity and easy of use for a user.

27. **In regard to claim 16**, Sweat et al further teaches said one or more media element selection criteria comprise a set of template data, each of said sets of template data listing a plurality of slots to be filled ([col 7, lines 12-18] palette is a template with a number of slots), and, for each slot, one or more associated requirements of media elements for filling said slot ([col 7, lines 12-18] user query sets criteria for filling the slot on the palette); and said one or more processors are further arranged in operation to provide said subset by, for each of said slots, retrieving one or more identifiers of media elements whose metadata accords with said one or more requirements for said slots ([col 7, lines 12-18] fully constructed palette can be saved and used). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an object-oriented database of Sweat et al with the apparatus of Reber et al because it would allow for greater compatibility, modularity and easy of use for a user.

Conclusion

28. The Examiner requests, in response to this Office action, that support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the Examiner in prosecuting the application.

29. When responding to this Office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Garrett Smith whose telephone number is (571) 270-1764. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 26, 2008

/GS/
Garrett Smith
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2168

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168